

Docket No. F-7179

Ser. No. 09/989,285

**REMARKS**

The Examiner maintains the rejections of the claims in view of Bromberg. Applicant traverses the rejection as follows.

In reviewing Bromberg, the reference fails to teach evaluating the actions of one member of an organization against the actions of another member of the same organization. As such, Applicant has amended the claims the further define the scope of the invention.

Furthermore, the four evaluation templates disclosed in Bromberg are common templates which are used for a member (i.e. a person) of an organization to capture, organize, store and present his or her own internal knowledge.

However, in contrast with the reference, the evaluation templates of the invention are different from such templates for a member of an organization to express his or her internal knowledge as disclosed by Bromberg. Specifically, the evaluation templates according to the invention are common templates for evaluating acts performed by a member in his or her work, and these acts in the member's work could be the socialization process, externalization process, combination process and internalization process. The evaluation templates of the invention enable it to evaluate how much the member has practiced these processes at work (see lines 3-19 on page 3 and line 22 on page 7-line 29 on page 8 of the Application). It is further pointed out that four evaluation

Docket No. F-7179

Ser. No. 09/989,285

templates disclosed in the reference merely correspond to only the tacit knowledge expression templates (12; Fig. 2) using in the externalization process as disclosed in the application (see lines 1-14 on page 9).

As the reference fails to teach the recited limitations, the claims are patentable thereover. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987) ("a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim" is found in the cited prior art reference).

Applicant respectfully requests a three month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. The fee of \$1020.00 for the extension is provided for in the charge authorization presented in the PTO Form 2038, Credit Card Payment form, provided herewith.

If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized in the Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 or the Form PTO-2038 is missing or fee payment via the Form PTO-2038 cannot be processed, the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Docket No. F-7179

Ser. No. 09/989,285

Respectfully submitted,  
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg  
C. Bruce Hamburg  
Reg. No. 22,389  
Attorney for Applicants  
and,

By T. David Bomzer  
T. David Bomzer  
Reg. No. 48,770  
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10168  
(212) 986-2340